



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/575,883	09/15/2006	Siegfried Ansorge	P29678	4705	
7055	7590	08/29/2008 GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C. 1950 ROLAND CLARKE PLACE RESTON, VA 20191			
		EXAMINER SZNAIDMAN, MARCOS L.			
		ART UNIT 1611		PAPER NUMBER 1611	
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE 08/29/2008 ELECTRONIC			

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

gbpatent@gbpatent.com  
pto@gbpatent.com

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	10/575,883	ANSORGE ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b> MARCOS SZNAIDMAN	Art Unit 1611

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 May 2008.

2a) This action is FINAL.      2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 77-92 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) 79-92 is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 77 and 78 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 13 pages / 11/30/06

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### **DETAILED ACTION**

This office action is in response to applicant's reply filed on May 13, 2008.

#### ***Election/Restrictions***

Applicant's election of Group IV (Claims 77-78, compounds of general formula D3) and compound D3.008 (see page 78 of the specification) as the elected species in the reply filed on May 13, 2008 is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).

Since the elected species is free of prior art, examination was expanded to the following species: Lupanine (CAS # 550-90-3).

#### ***Status of Claims***

Claims 77-92 are currently pending and are the subject of this office action.

Claims 79-92 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected inventions, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on May 13, 2008.

Claims 77-78 are presently under examination.

#### ***Priority***

The present application is a 371 of PCT/EP04/11645 filed on 10/15/2004.

Should applicant desire to obtain the benefit of foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d) prior to declaration of an interference, a certified English translation of the foreign application must be submitted in reply to this action. 37 CFR 41.154(b) and 41.202(e).

Failure to provide a certified translation may result in no benefit being accorded for the non-English application.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 77 and 78 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. This is a written description rejection.

Claims 77 and 78 describe Lupanine (species examined for general formula D3, see claim 77), including tautomers, stereoisomers thereof, pharmaceutically acceptable salts, salt derivatives, tautomers and stereoisomers thereof.

M.P.E.P. #2163 states: "An applicant shows possession of the claimed invention by describing the claimed invention with all of its limitations using such descriptive means as words, structures, figures, diagrams, and formulas that fully set forth the

claimed invention....one must define a compound by 'whatever characteristics sufficiently distinguish it'. A lack of adequate written description issue also arises if the knowledge and level of skill in the art would not permit one skilled in the art to immediately envisage the product claimed from the disclosed process".

While the specification describes compounds of general formula D3 (see claim 77), it does not describe any derivative as to convey possession of the entire genus encompassed by derivatives.

Given the broad scope of the claimed subject matter, Applicant has not provided sufficient written description that would allow the skilled artisan to recognize all the derivatives claimed.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.

3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 77 and 78 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Santana et. al. (J. Agric. Food Chem. (2002) 50:2318-2323). Claims 77 and 78 recite a pharmaceutical or cosmetic composition comprising at least one of a pharmaceutically acceptable carrier and a pharmaceutically or cosmetically acceptable adjuvant and at least one active ingredient selected from formula D3.

For claims 77 and 78, Santana et. al. teach the following compound: Lupanine (see Figure 1, page 2319) that reads on general structure D3.

Santana et. al. do not teach a pharmaceutical or cosmetic composition of Lupanine comprising at least one of a pharmaceutically acceptable carrier and a

pharmaceutically or cosmetically acceptable adjuvant. However, Santana et. al further teach a composition of Lupanine in aqueous media (see Materials and Methods-Growth Media on page 2319). (see abstract).

Since Santana et. al. teach a composition comprising Lupanine, , at the time of the invention it would have been *prima facie* obvious for a person of ordinary skill in the art to prepare a composition comprising Lupanine and a cosmetically acceptable carrier and/or adjuvant, with the motivation of obtaining a better cosmetic formulation of Lupanine, thus resulting in the practice of claims 77 and 78 with a reasonable expectation of success.

The statement in claim 77: "a pharmaceutical or cosmetic" is considered an intended use and does not add any new limitation to the claim. Catalina Mktg. Int'l, Inc. V. Coolsavings.com, Inc., 289 F.3d 801, 808, 62 USPQ2d 1781, 1785 (fed. Cir. 2002). "The recitation of a new intended use for an old product does not make a claim to that old product patentable." In re Schreiber, 44 USPQ2d 1429 (Fed. Cir. 1997).

### ***Double Patenting***

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re*

*Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 77-78 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 78-79 of copending Application No. 10/575,878. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because claims 78 and 79 of the copending application recite a pharmaceutical or cosmetic composition comprising at least one of a pharmaceutically acceptable carrier and a pharmaceutically or cosmetically acceptable adjuvant and at least one active ingredient selected from the formulas C1 to C17, which includes the compound C8.004 (page 28) or C16.001 (see page 36), which are identical to applicant's elected species (compound D3.008 (see page 78 of the instant application)).

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claims 77-78 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 77-78 of copending Application No. 10/575,882. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because claims 77 and 78 of the

copending application recite a pharmaceutical or cosmetic composition comprising at least one of a pharmaceutically acceptable carrier and a pharmaceutically or cosmetically acceptable adjuvant and at least one active ingredient selected from the formulas A1 to A14, which includes the compound A3.001 (page 16) or A9.001 (see page 107), which are identical to applicant's elected species (compound D3.008 (see page 78 of the instant application)).

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

### ***Conclusion***

No claims are allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MARCOS SZNAIDMAN whose telephone number is (571)270-3498. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday 8 AM to 6 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sharmila G. Landau can be reached on 571 272-0614. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/MARCOS SZNAIDMAN/  
Examiner, Art Unit 1611  
August 22, 2008

/Sharmila Gollamudi Landau/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1611